UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/083,926 | 02/27/2002 | Lixiao Wang | 10527-395001 / 02-026 | 4859 |
| 26161 FISH & RICHA | 7590 09/16/200 ARDSON PC | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 1022 | | SEVERSON, RYAN J | | |
| MIINNEAPOLI | S, MN 55440-1022 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 3731 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/16/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/083,926 | WANG ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Ryan Severson | 3731 | | |

| | Ryan Severson | 3731 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the properties of the petition with the petition with the petition of the petition with the petition with the petition of the petition with the petition of the petition of the petition of the petition with the petition of t | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially red | E below); lucing or simplifying tl | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | | • |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-18,20-34,43,73-78 and 82-93. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19. | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | of the status of the claims after en | itry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731 | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As an initial matter, the claim amendments were entered because the only amendments made were to cancel previously withdrawn claims.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the second material extending through the body portion, tapered portions, and sleeve portions of the balloon) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, applicant's argument that Grayzel does not show the material extending "substantially" the length of the balloon is not persuasive because the arguments and specification do not limit the claims to such a narrow interpretation and there is no specific definition of the term "substantially" provided at any point in the specification.